

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

MINUTES
BUSINESS MEETING AND ANNUAL PLANNING SESSION

June 20-21, 2001

The Board of Education and the Board of Vocational met for the regular business meeting in Senate Room A of the General Assembly Building, Richmond, Virginia, with the following board members present:

Mr. Kirk T. Schroder, President
Ms. Susan T. Noble, Vice President
Mr. Mark C. Christie
Mrs. Audrey B. Davidson

Mrs. Susan L. Genovese
Mr. Scott Goodman
Dr. Gary L. Jones
Mrs. Ruby W. Rogers

Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mr. Schroder, president, presided and called the meeting to order at 9:21 a.m.

INVOCATION AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Mr. Schroder asked for a moment of silence and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD

Mrs. Rogers made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 24, 2001 minutes of the Board. Copies of the minutes had been distributed previously to all members of the Board for review. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Genovese and carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The following items were added to the consent agenda: *Item I, First Review of Appointments and Reappointments to the Accountability Advisory Committee*; and *Item K, First Review of a Request from Southampton County Public Schools Concerning a Literary Fund Loan*. Mrs. Genovese made a motion to adopt the amended agenda. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mrs. Davidson made a motion to approve the amended agenda. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously.

- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Release of Literary Fund Loans for Placement on Waiting List
- Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literary Fund Loans
- Final Review of Financial Report
- First Review of the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) for Regulations Governing the Re-Enrollment Plan for Students Who Were Served in Correctional Facilities
- First Review of Proposed Revisions to the Licensure Regulations for School Personnel (8 VAC 20-21)
- Report on Findings of Phase I Academic Reviews
- First Review of Appointments and Reappointments to the Accountability Advisory Committee
- First Review of a Request from Southampton County Public Schools Concerning a Literary Fund Loan

Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Release of Literary Fund Loans for Placement on Waiting List

The Department of Education's recommendation that funding for four projects in the amount of \$16,900,000 to be released, that the interest rate for the two Alleghany County projects remain at three percent since it is the interest rate that matches the new composite index for the consolidated school division, and that funding for four projects in the amount of \$14,100,000 be deferred and the projects be placed on the First Priority Waiting List, was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

COUNTY, CITY, OR TOWN	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Alleghany Highlands	Alleghany Elementary	\$7,500,000.00
Alleghany Highlands	Alleghany Middle	\$7,500,000.00
Petersburg City	Petersburg High School	\$1,000,000.00
Patrick County	Patrick Springs Primary	\$900,000.00
	TOTAL	\$16,900,000.00

First Priority Waiting List

COUNTY, CITY, OR TOWN	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Wythe County	New Rural Retreat Elementary	\$5,750,000.00
Wythe County	Jackson Memorial Elementary	\$5,100,000.00
Russell County	Lebanon Middle	\$1,500,000.00
Russell County	Castlewood High	\$1,750,000.00
	TOTAL	\$14,100,000.00

Final Review of Recommendations Concerning Applications for Literacy Fund Loans

The Department of Education's recommendation to approve four new applications in the amount of \$14,100,000 subject to review and approval by the Office of the Attorney General pursuant to Section 22.1-156, Code of Virginia was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

COUNTY, CITY, OR TOWN	SCHOOL	AMOUNT
Wythe County	New Rural Retreat Elementary	\$5,750,000.00
Wythe County	Jackson Memorial Elementary	\$5,100,000.00
Russell County	Lebanon Middle	\$1,500,000.00
Russell County	Castlewood High	\$1,750,000.00
	TOTAL	\$14,100,000.00

Final Review of Financial Report on Literacy Fund

The Department of Education's recommendation for approval of the financial report on the status of the Literacy Fund as of April 30, 2001 was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

Final Review of the Notice of Intended Regulatory Action (NOIRA) for Regulations Governing the Re-Enrollment Plan for Students Who Were Served in Correctional Facilities

The Department of Education's recommendation that the Board of Education authorize the Department of Education staff to proceed with the NOIRA for the regulations for the re-enrollment plan was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

Final Review of Proposed Revisions to the Licensure Regulations for School Personnel (8 VAC 20-21)

The Department of Education's recommendation that the Board of Education approve the proposed amendments to the Licensure Regulations for School Personnel and authorize the continuation of the Administrative Process Act (APA), including public comment, was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

Report on Findings of Phase 1 Academic Reviews

The Department of Education's recommendation that the Board of Education accept the Report on Findings of Phase 1 Academic Reviews for information was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda. This report details the areas for improvement most often cited in warned schools, suggestions for school improvement planning most often cited in final reports, and principal/teacher perceptions of the Academic Review process, implementation, and outcomes.

Final Review of Appointments and Reappointments to the Accountability Advisory Committee

The Accountability Advisory Committee is a committee appointed by the Board of Education to advise it on matters relating to assessment and accountability. It is composed of representatives of the business community, parent organizations, teacher and school administrators, and the general public. Members are appointed by the Board of Education for three-year terms. Vacancies are filled annually as terms expire or as other circumstances dictate. The following appointments were accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda: Dr. Gary L. Jones was designated to replace Mrs. Jennifer Byler as Co-Chair; Dr. Al Butler was reappointed; new appointments included Mrs. Sally Revenson to fill the unexpired term of Dr. Gary Jones, and other new appointments were Diana Nuckols, Linda Garnett, and Lawrence Lenz.

First Review of a Request from Southampton County Public Schools Concerning a Literary Fund Loan

The Department of Education's recommendation that the Board of Education consider the request from Southampton County Public Schools to have the Literary Fund Loan applications for the Hunterdale Elementary School and Capron Elementary School projects treated as emergency request and the projects be added to the First Priority Waiting List subject to the approval of the Office of the Attorney General was accepted by the Board of Education's vote on the consent agenda.

RESOLUTIONS AND RECOGNITIONS

A Resolution of Recognition was presented to the following members of the Adult Education Task Force:

- Carolyn Baker, Charlotte County Public Schools
- Steve F. Clementi, Verizon
- The Honorable Emmett W. Hanger, Jr., The Senate of Virginia
- Scott Leak, Richmond Newspaper, Inc.
- Philip L. Miller, Northern Shenandoah Valley Adult Education, Virginia Association of Adult and Continuing Education
- Mary E. Peacock, Board Member Emeritus, Virginia Literacy Foundation
- The Honorable Kenneth R. Plum, The House of Delegates of Virginia

- Dr. B. Carlyle Ramsey, Danville Community College
- Gregory T. Smith, Literacy Council of Northern Virginia
- Dr. Preston M. Royster, Ex Officio, Virginia Advisory Council for Adult Education and Literacy
- Dr. Yvonne V. Thayer, Ex Officio, Office of Adult Education and Literacy, Virginia Department of Education
- Mark E. Emblidge, Co-Chair, Virginia Literacy Foundation
- Audrey B. Davidson, Co-Chair, Virginia Board of Education

DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

Presentation of the Final Report of the Task Force on Adult Education's Task Force on Adult Education and Literacy

Mrs. Davidson, Mr. Emblidge, and Dr. Thayer presented this item. Mrs. Davidson reported that in September 2000, the president of the Board of Education appointed a task force to study adult education in Virginia. The Task Force on Adult Education and Literacy was charged with the responsibility to look internally and externally for solutions to the challenges facing adult education in Virginia. The Task Force was asked to study services needed and resources required to provide services. The Task Force met regularly from September 2000 through May 2001. The Task Force heard from various providers of literacy services in Virginia as well as individuals from North Carolina, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky. According to the 2000 Census data report, there are over 700,000 Virginians without a high school credential who can benefit from adult education. The Department of Education provides oversight to 116 adult education programs that are funded with federal or state funds and are held accountable through the National Reporting System. Approximately 31,000 adults are served annually. The Code of Virginia places the responsibility for adult education with the State Board of Education.

Dr. Thayer reported on the history of the adult education program in Virginia. Dr. Thayer said that the adult education program throughout the Commonwealth serves two populations. It serves Virginians without a high school diploma and the second language population who move to Virginia with credentials from other countries who need basic literacy skills. The adult education program is divided into several levels. Adult basic education provides basic skills to adults who are performing below the ninth-grade level in reading, writing, computation, computer literacy, problem solving, and critical thinking skills. The secondary programs are for adults who want to complete their high school diploma or become eligible for a General Educational Development credential or the GED. The GED testing program requires successful completion of a battery of five comprehensive examinations in writing skills, social studies, science, interpreting literature and the arts, and mathematics. The programs are managed and delivered by local school divisions, regional consortia, or community-based organizations. In 2000-01, Virginia received \$10.5 million in federal funds and \$3.5 in state funds for adult education.

Mr. Emblidge reported that the Task Force on Adult Education and Literacy made the following recommendations:

1. Family literacy should be a priority for the Board of Education.
2. An organizational structure and resources should be provided to establish family literacy programs throughout Virginia.
 - 2.1 A state family literacy grant program should be developed. Initially, one million dollars will be needed to fund 20 grants. This fund should continue to grow until every locality in the commonwealth has at least one family literacy grant.
 - 2.2 The Even Start program, a federally-funded family literacy program, should become part of the program of the Virginia Department of Education's Office of Adult Education and Literacy.
 - 2.3 A Family Literacy Center should be established to identify best practices in family literacy, provide training to educators who deliver such services, and develop materials for use throughout the state. An allocation of \$300,000 would be required to operate the center.
 - 2.4 The Office of Adult Education and Literacy should be elevated to a division within the organizational structure of the Department of Education.
3. The Board of Education should appoint an Advisory Council on Adult Education to report annually to the Board.

Family Literacy:

Mrs. Davidson made a motion to adopt the resolution on Family Literacy. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously. The resolution reads as follows:

*Resolution of the Board of Education:
Family Literacy*

WHEREAS, the Task Force on Adult Education and Literacy recommends that family literacy should be a priority for the Board of Education; and

WHEREAS, the citizens of Virginia expect all students to learn and perform well in school; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Education has made a strong commitment to the Standards of Learning and its accompanying accountability program as a way of raising educational standards for all students; and

WHEREAS, parents must be full partners in the learning process as they are children's first and most important teachers; and

WHEREAS, research confirms that the education level of the parent is a good predictor of how a student will perform in school; and

WHEREAS, adult education is the responsibility of the Board of Education and the school divisions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Education that it is recommended that family literacy become a primary delivery system of adult education and a key strategy for helping children prepare for and do well in school.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT by communicating the importance of family literacy programs to parents, school administrators, teachers, citizens, and policy makers we will raise the level of awareness of family literacy and its potential for breaking the cycle of intergenerational illiteracy in Virginia.

Adopted in Richmond, Virginia, This Twentieth Day of June in the Year 2001.

State Family Literacy Grant Program:

Mrs. Davidson made a motion to adopt the resolution on State Family Literacy Grant Program. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones for purpose of discussion. Mr. Schroder explained to the Task Force that the Board of Education does not have any monetary authority and the effect of this resolution is an endorsement of the concept and funding. The funding for the family literacy grants is at the discretion of the Governor and the ultimate authority is the General Assembly on this matter.

Mr. Schroder said that the concept of the State Family Literacy Grant Program is to have each school division create a program on family literacy. Dr. DeMary said that there are tremendous efforts among the school divisions to involve parents in education. The grant program that the committee is recommending is much more defined in terms of what that means and is looking at supporting parents as their child's first and most important teacher.

The Board unanimously agreed to adopt the concept of the State Family Literacy Grant Program. Mr. Schroder said that upon signing the resolution he will communicate it to the Governor and ask on behalf of the Board that he consider this issue in his upcoming budget. The resolution reads as follows:

*Resolution of the Board of Education:
State Family Literacy Grant Program*

WHEREAS, the Task Force on Adult Education and Literacy recommends that a state family literacy grant program be developed; and

WHEREAS, the Task Force on Adult Education and Literacy advises that, initially, \$1,000,000 will be needed to fund 20 grants to local programs; and

WHEREAS, the Task Force recommends that the fund continue to grow until every locality in the commonwealth has a least one family literacy grant; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary, superintendent of public instruction, has asked the Office of Adult Education and Literacy to coordinate family literacy activities so that providers in various offices of the Department of Education and other agencies and foundations can collaborate and share information; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Education is seeking a federal Even Start Statewide Literacy Initiative Grant to support this coordination; and

WHEREAS, adult education is the responsibility of the Board of Education and the school divisions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Education that it is recommended that a state family literacy grant program be developed.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Education requests the Governor to include in the 2002-2003 budget an annual allocation of \$1,000,000 to fund family literacy grants.

Adopted in Richmond, Virginia, This Twentieth Day of June in the Year 2001.

Organizational Placement of the Virginia Even Start Program:

The Task Force asked the Superintendent of Public Instruction to consider the possibility of making a structural change at the Department of Education and moving Virginia's Even Start Program under Adult Education and Literacy because it is a family literacy program. The Even Start Program is currently under Compensatory Programs. The Task Force asked the Superintendent to present a report at the September Board meeting on this possibility.

State Family Literacy Center:

Mrs. Davidson made a motion to adopt the resolution stating the Board's endorsement of a State Family Literacy Center. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones and carried unanimously. The resolution reads as follows:

*Resolution of the Board of Education:
State Family Literacy Center*

WHEREAS, the Task Force on Adult Education and Literacy recommends that a state family literacy center be established to identify best practices in family literacy, provide training to educators who deliver such services, and develop materials for use throughout the state; and

WHEREAS, Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary, superintendent of public instruction, has asked the Office of Adult Education and Literacy to coordinate family literacy activities so that providers in various offices of the Department of Education and other agencies and foundations can collaborate and share information; and

WHEREAS, the Department of Education is seeking a federal Even Start Statewide Literacy Initiative Grant to support this coordination; and

WHEREAS, the Office of Adult Education and Literacy is not staffed to support a major family literacy initiative; and

WHEREAS, an allocation of \$300,000 would be required to operate the center; and

WHEREAS, adult education is the responsibility of the Board of Education and the school divisions;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Education that it is recommended that a state family literacy center be established under the direction of the Department of Education.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Education requests the Governor to include in the 2002-2003 budget an annual allocation of \$300,000 to operate a family literacy center in Virginia.

Adopted in Richmond, Virginia, This Twentieth Day of June in the Year 2001.

Office of Adult Education and Literacy:

The Task Force asked the Superintendent of Public Instruction to consider elevating the Office of Adult Education and Literacy to a division within the organizational structure at the Department of Education. Mrs. Davidson complimented Dr. DeMary for moving the Office of Adult Education and Literacy out of Career and Technical Education and placing it under Instruction since the task force was formed.

Establishment and Operation of the Adult Education and Literacy Advisory Committee of the Virginia Board of Education:

Mrs. Davidson made a motion to adopt the resolution for the establishment and operation of the Adult Education and Literacy Advisory Committee of the Virginia Board of Education. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Genovese and carried unanimously. Mr. Schroder said that once the resolution is adopted, official appointments and terms of service would be made. Mr. Schroder suggested adding the following statement: That the existing membership will be reappointed in whole and asked the co-chairs to hold a lottery for terms. The resolution reads as follows:

*Resolution of the Virginia Board of Education
For The
Establishment and Operation of the
Adult Education and Literacy Advisory Committee of the Virginia Board of Education*

Recitals

WHEREAS, on June 20, 2001, the Virginia Board of Education (the "Board") authorized its President to establish and appoint an advisory committee to convene and give advice and recommendations, from time to time, to the Board concerning the implementation and operation of the Adult Education and Literacy Program (the "Program"); and

WHEREAS, the Board of Education established a standing committee of the Board entitled the Adult Education and Literacy Advisory Committee; and

WHEREAS, on June 20 2001, the Board of Education deemed it appropriate to incorporate into the charter of the Committee the recommendations made to the Board by the Task Force on Adult Education and Literacy; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Education now designates the name of the Committee to be the ADULT EDUCATION AND LITERACY Advisory Committee of the Board of Education (the "Committee") which shall have as its purpose to serve in an advisory capacity to the Board on matters related to adult education and literacy priorities for program initiatives and resources in the Commonwealth (the "Adult Education and Literacy Program"); and

WHEREAS, The Committee shall meet and operate within the scope of its authority and duties stated below.

ARTICLE ONE: PURPOSE

The Committee is hereby established as a standing committee of the Board for the sole purpose of advising and making recommendations to the Board on ways and means of improving the Adult Education and Literacy Program, from time to time, as the Committee deems appropriate. Subject to the terms and conditions of this Resolution, the Committee shall have the authority to review all procedures and operations of the Adult Education and Literacy Program. The Committee Co-Chairmen will present all recommendations to the Board at appropriate times during regular meetings of the Board. In addition, the Committee shall file an annual report to the Board. The Committee agrees that it will act only within the scope of authority expressly stated in this Resolution. All Committee members acknowledge, by virtue of their service on the Committee, that their authority with respect to the adult education and literacy program is limited to the matters expressly stated in Article 1 of this Resolution. All Committee members also acknowledge, by virtue of their service on the Committee, their basic support for the Adult Education and Literacy Program and commitment to making the Adult Education and Literacy Program as productive and successful as possible.

ARTICLE TWO: MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. Composition. The Committee shall consist of thirteen (13) members and two Committee Co-Chairmen. All initial members of the Committee and the Committee Co-Chairmen shall be appointed by the President of the Board and thereafter, all subsequent vacancies and appointments shall be made by the Board.

Section 2. Term of Membership. Every appointment to the Committee shall be for a term of three years, except that the initial appointments shall be established in three equal groups of members with an initial term of one year, two years and three years respectively in order to establish three separate classes of members with varied terms. No member of the Board shall be appointed to more than two consecutive three-year terms. Any member of the Committee may be removed by the Board, at any time, with or without cause.

ARTICLE THREE: MEETINGS

Section 1. Regular Meetings. The Committee shall adopt a tentative schedule for regular meetings for each applicable calendar year. Such schedule shall be subject to the change, alteration or adjustment by the Co-Chairmen, as they deem appropriate, to accommodate the operation of the Committee as is necessary.

Section 2. Special Meetings. A special meeting of members may be called by the Co-Chairmen in their sole discretion or upon the written request to the Co-Chairmen by six or more members of the Committee. No business other than that specified in the notice of the meeting shall be transacted at any special meeting of the Committee.

Section 3. Place of Meetings. All meetings of the Committee shall be held in Richmond, Virginia, in order to accommodate the accessibility of data and information from the Virginia Department of Education.

Section 4. Adjournment. Any duly called meeting of the Committee may be adjourned to a later time and place, determined by the Committee members present at such meeting, whether such members constitute a quorum for transaction of business, provided that such time and place are announced at the meeting, and no other notice of the adjourned meeting shall be required.

Section 5. Voting Proxies. At meetings of the Committee, all members present shall be entitled to exercise voting rights on all matters. Members not present at a meeting shall not be entitled to vote by proxy.

Section 6. Notices of Meetings. Written notice stating the place, day and hour of any meeting of the members, and, in case of a special meeting, the purpose or purposes for which the meeting is called, shall be given not less than 10 days before the date of the meeting by or at the direction of the Co-Chairmen. A notice shall be deemed duly given to a Committee member when it is: (1) adopted by the Committee as part of its tentative regular meeting schedule and is not subsequently changed or altered or (2) delivered in person or mailed, postage-prepaid, to the address of such Committee member as it appears

on the records of the Committee or (3) when it is sent via telecopier or electronic mail transmission to the telecopier number or electronic mail address of such Committee member, and the sender has received a confirmation message that such transmission has been received.

Section 7. Voting and Quorum. Each member of the Committee shall be entitled to one vote with respect to each matter voted on by the Committee. A majority of the members of the Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business. Except as expressly provided otherwise in this Resolution, the vote of a majority of the Committee members present at any meeting at which a quorum is present shall be the act of the Committee.

Section 8. Conflict of Interest. In any case where a member shall have a personal interest in a particular vote of the Committee, such member(s) shall excuse themselves from the vote of the Committee thereon.

Section 9. Waiver. Whenever any notice is required to be given under the provisions of law or this Resolution, a written waiver thereof, signed by the person or persons entitled to such notice and filed with the records of the meeting, whether before or after the time stated therein, shall be conclusively deemed to be equivalent to such notice. In addition, any member who attends a meeting of the Committee without protesting at the commencement of the meeting such lack of notice shall be conclusively deemed to have waived notice of such meeting.

ARTICLE FOUR: EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

The Committee may decide to go into executive session at any of its meetings in accordance with the laws of the Commonwealth of Virginia. Prior to meeting in an executive session, the Committee must adopt a motion to go into executive session. The Committee shall discuss only matters in an executive session as specified by the Virginia Freedom of Information Act or other applicable law. The Committee may take no final action on any item in executive session. At the conclusion of any executive session, the Committee must reconvene in public session and take a vote of the membership to come out of executive session.

ARTICLE FIVE: PROCEEDINGS OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS

All proceeding of the Committee meetings shall be as prescribed by Roberts Rules of Order.

ARTICLE SIX: AGENDA FOR MEETING

The Committee will have a published agenda for all regularly scheduled public meetings as set forth by the Committee Co-Chairmen.

ARTICLE SEVEN: COMMITTEE CO-CHAIRMEN

Section 1. Committee Co-Chairmen. The initial Co-Chairmen of the Committee shall be appointed by the President of the Board and thereafter, upon any expiration of term or vacancy of such positions, by the Board. It is the intent of the Board to have one Co-Chairman be an active educator or provider of adult education services in the Commonwealth and the other Co-Chairman be a present or past member of the Board or any other citizen of the Commonwealth. The Co-Chairmen shall each have individual voting rights on all matters before the Committee. However, the Co-Chairmen shall act in unanimous agreement and consent on all matters in the execution and carrying out of their joint office. No Co-Chairman can act on any matter pertaining to this joint office without the consent of the other Co-Chairman. The Co-Chairmen shall preside over meetings of the Committee and shall have all powers and

duties as necessary to fulfill the role of chief executive of the Committee and its presiding officer and as may be, from time to time, conferred or prescribed by the Committee. The Co-Chairmen shall exercise supervision and direction over the Committee's goals and affairs and discharge all duties generally pertaining to such joint office as the Executive head of an organization of this character subject to the control of the Committee members.

Section 2. Other Officers. Additional officers may, in the discretion of the Committee, be elected from time to time to perform such duties and undertake such functions as designated by the Committee.

ARTICLE EIGHT: COMMITTEE OPERATIONS

Section 1. Official Papers. All official records of the Committee shall be kept on file in the Department of Education and shall be open to inspection.

Section 2. Superintendent of Public Instruction. The Superintendent of Public Instruction is hereby directed to provide all necessary staff support to the Committee in order to fulfill its duties herein.

ARTICLE NINE: AMENDMENTS

This Resolution may be altered, amended or repealed only by the Board after a first and final review has been completed in two separate meetings. The preceding requirement of a first and final review in two separate meetings may not be waived by the Board, unless such waiver is approved by every member of the Board.

ARTICLE TEN: MISCELLANEOUS

Section 1. Addresses. The addresses and/or telephone numbers used in any notice given under this Resolution shall be those appearing on the books of the Committee, and it shall be the individual member's responsibility to insure that the Virginia Department of Education has the correct address.

Section 2. Roberts Rules. Except as otherwise stated herein, all meetings of the Committee shall be governed by Roberts Rules of Order.

Section 3. Gender. All personal pronouns used in this Resolution, whether used in the masculine, feminine, or neuter gender, shall include all other genders, the singular shall include the plural, and vice versa, as the context may require.

Section 4. Copy to All Members. The Board hereby directs the Superintendent of Public Instruction to provide all Committee members with current copy of these Bylaws and all amendments thereto.

The undersigned, being the duly elected President of the Virginia Board of Education, hereby certifies that the foregoing Resolution was duly adopted by its members as of the date below.

Adopted in Richmond, Virginia, This Twentieth Day of June in the Year 2001.

Dr. Jones asked the task force what consideration has been given to raising the bar and what is the pass/fail rate of students who attempt the GED. Dr. Jones said these students do not have the background of the SOLs, and he is concerned for students who have failed at almost everything they have tried before attempting to get a GED.

First Review of the Board of Education's Leadership Development Curriculum

Dr. Patricia Wright, assistant superintendent for instruction at the Department of Education, presented this item to the Board for review and approval. The Virginia Board of Education adopted a Resolution on Leadership Development at its November 1999 meeting. President Schroder established two committees to assist in developing a curriculum for public school students in kindergarten through grade twelve. In January 2001, members of the Leadership Development Committee, comprised of some of Virginia's most recognized and successful leaders, met to generate ideas for themes and concepts about leadership that they felt should be included in the curriculum. The Leadership Drafting Subcommittee, consisting of educators who currently incorporate the development of leadership skills into their instruction and their extra-curricular work with students, used the ideas from the committee, as well as current research on effective leadership, to create the Leadership Development Curriculum. At a meeting in May 2001, the Leadership Development Committee endorsed the leadership student expectations component of the document.

The Leadership Development Curriculum consists of several components. The introduction, goals, and strands explain the principles around which the document is organized. The defined goals of the Leadership Development Curriculum are as follows: to develop in every K-12 student an awareness of his or her own leadership potential; to assist young people in developing essential leadership skills that enable them to act responsibly in all aspects of their lives; to develop citizens who possess the leadership abilities to meet present and future challenges in a global society; and to provide students with opportunities to learn and practice essential leadership skills within a learning community. The organizing strands that frame the document at all grade levels include: Developing Knowledge of Self and Others, Defining Leadership, Developing Leadership Skills and Practices, and Practicing Leadership through Service.

The curriculum is sub-divided into grade clusters for the purpose of developing student leadership expectations: K-2, 3-5, 6-8, and 9-12. Each grade cluster contains thirteen expectations that provide an array of skills, processes, and opportunities that enable students to develop leadership skills appropriate to their age group. The expectations will be supplemented by the components listed below to create a Web-based curriculum that the Department of Education will continue to expand as additional resources and information are added.

Additional components of the Leadership Development Curriculum include: (1) sample teaching activities that incorporate the development of leadership skills into content instruction that already occurs in Virginia's schools; (2) an extensive list of resources that includes books, guides, Web sites, and other materials that may assist teachers as they include leadership development in their daily instruction; (3) a chart showing the developmental nature of the leadership student expectations across grade clusters; (4) samples of leadership curricula that have been developed by other Virginia programs; and (5) correlations of the Virginia Standards of Learning and Career and Technical Education Competencies to the leadership student expectations.

Mrs. Genovese made a motion to waive first review and accept for final review the proposed leadership student expectations as an approved component of the Leadership Development Curriculum. The motion was seconded by Mrs. Rogers and carried unanimously. The resolution reads as follows:

*Resolution of the Board of Education:
Leadership Development Curriculum*

WHEREAS, education plays an important role in the development of leaders and the acquisition of leadership skills; and

WHEREAS, leadership training and education need to be based on what will be required when students take on leadership responsibilities; and

WHEREAS, leadership development supports and reinforces academic achievement in relation to the Virginia Standards of Learning; and

WHEREAS, in recognition of the need for leadership ability in all aspects of life, the Board of Education adopted a Resolution on Leadership Development at its November 1999 meeting; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Education established a Leadership Development Committee consisting of some of Virginia's most recognized and successful leaders to oversee the development of an optional K-12 Leadership Development Curriculum; and

WHEREAS, a model Leadership Development Curriculum was developed by a committee of educators who currently incorporate the development of leadership skills into their instruction and their extra-curricular work with students;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Education that the optional Leadership Development Curriculum be endorsed as a model for schools to use in preparing students in kindergarten through grade twelve for their individual and group leadership responsibilities.

Adopted in Richmond, Virginia, This Twentieth Day of June in the Year 2001.

First Review of a Request for a Waiver of a Provision in the Regulations Establishing Standards for Accrediting Public Schools in Virginia

Mr. Charles Finley, assistant superintendent for accountability services at the Department of Education, informed the Board that the Pulaski County School Board is requesting a waiver of the provision in 8 VAC 20-131-90.C. of the accrediting standards that requires level one of a foreign language to be available to eighth graders as part of the middle school instructional program. The school board has cited a number of issues in its rationale for the request for a waiver including: budgetary constraints and low enrollment in foreign languages in the middle schools; the availability of a number of options at the high school; concerns with meeting the 140 clock hours of instruction required for credit-bearing courses; and the lack of opportunities to pursue other course offerings for students who choose to take a foreign language. Dr. R. Eddy Daniel, assistant superintendent of Pulaski County Public Schools and Mr. Paul Phillips, chair, Pulaski County School Board, were available to answer several questions regarding this request.

The Board noted that French is the only foreign language option made available to meet the eighth grade foreign language requirements of the Standards of Accreditation in Pulaski County and asked if it was possible to offer another foreign language, such as Spanish. It appears that the eighth graders are not able to continue with French once they enter high school. The Board also noted that 140 clock hours of instruction required for credit-bearing courses, is inconsistent with the middle school scheduling. The Pulaski representatives assured the Board that the core courses at the high school are consistent with the 140 clock hours of instruction. The Board received the request for first review and will take on final review in July. Mr. Schroder said he was concerned about the impact of denying opportunities to a student desiring to take French as a foreign language.

First Review of Standards of Learning Cut-Scores

Ms. Cameron Harris, assistant superintendent for assessment and reporting at the Department of Education, presented this item to the Board. At its October 1998 three-day meeting, the Board established the cut scores for each of the Standards of Learning (SOL) tests. The cut-scores represent the expected level of performance for first, passing the test, "Pass Proficient" and the higher level of recognition, "Pass Advanced". The Board reviewed the recommended ranges of scores as determined by the eight Standard Setting Committees. The Standard Setting Advisory Committee, which reviewed the procedures used by the eight Standard Setting Committees, reported to the Board of Education that the committee members were experienced in their field, represented the diversity of the Commonwealth, and employed accepted procedures in deriving their recommendations. At the conclusion of the three-day meeting, cut-scores were adopted by the Board. The adopted cut-scores represent the standard of rigor applied to the "Pass Proficient" and "Pass Advanced" performance levels on all SOL tests administered in Virginia.

In June of 2000 the Board of Education set the cut-scores for the new World Geography test. Spring 2001 represents the fourth application of the cut-score standard to SOL tests.

Mrs. Genovese made a motion to ask the superintendent and staff at the Department of Education to recommend a process for reviewing the cut-scores and determining if adjustments are warranted by this fall in order for the Board to conduct this procedure by the end of the calendar year. The motion was seconded by Dr. Jones and carried unanimously.

Report on the Results of the Second Commonwealth Education Poll Conducted for the Commonwealth Educational Policy Institute by the VCU Center for Public Policy

Dr. William C. Boshier, Jr., Executive Director of CEPI, and Dr. Robert Holsworth, Director of the Center for Public Policy at VCU presented the results of the second Commonwealth Education Poll, which was conducted in April 2001. Dr. Boshier

and Dr. Holsworth were assisted by Dr. R. Daniel Norman, Deputy Director of CEPI, and Kate Ehlenberger, Esq., CEPI Graduate Research Associate.

The Commonwealth of Education Poll is a public opinion survey of Virginia residents on education issues. The survey is conducted by telephone with a randomly-selected sample of adult Virginians. Interviewing for the Commonwealth Education Poll was conducted by telephone from facilities of the Survey and Evaluation Research Laboratory at Virginia Commonwealth University in Richmond. The interviewing is conducted by a staff of professionally trained, paid interviewers using computer-assisted telephone interviewing software.

The Commonwealth Education Poll shows that Virginians are more positive than negative about the quality of public schools and the impact of the SOLs on school quality. The Commonwealth Education Poll was conducted by Virginia Commonwealth University, April 17-24 with 814 adults in Virginia. The following topics were addressed in the poll:

1. Overall School Performance
2. Opinion on the SOLs
3. How to Improve Student Achievement: Teachers and Class Size
4. School Funding
5. Opinion on School Vouchers
6. Problems Facing Local Schools
7. Support for Character Education

About three in ten Virginians (29 percent) say schools in their community have improved over the past five years and another thirty-five percent think the schools have held steady. Just 16 percent think the schools have gotten worse. Those with more direct experience in the schools—parents of children attending the schools—are especially positive. A plurality of public school parents (41 percent) say the schools have gotten better and another third say they have stayed the same, leaving just 17 percent who feel they have gotten worse. Others close to the front lines—households with school employees—are also positive about school progress, 45 percent of this group think the schools have gotten better; 28 percent say they have stayed the same and only 16 percent say they have gotten worse.

Virginians are about evenly split over the accuracy of the SOL test scores. A net 44 percent of all Virginians are either very or somewhat confident that the SOL test scores are an “accurate indicator of student progress and school achievement” while 46 percent have either not much or no confidence that the tests are a valid measure.

Virginians strongly endorse smaller class sizes as a way to help improve student achievement. Eighty-two percent thought this would help improve student achievement a lot. Six in ten Virginians endorse the idea that special training for teachers beyond a college degree helps improve student achievement and nearly 3 in ten (28 percent) feel this helps a little. A majority of all Virginians feel that raising teacher salaries will help

improve student achievement; 51 percent think this will help a lot and another 26 percent think this will help a little.

The poll found seven in ten Virginians (70 percent) believe funding for the schools is not enough. Just two in ten (21 percent) think that current funding is enough. The belief that school funding is not enough is widely shared regardless of political party, race, education, income, or region of residence within the state. Fifty-seven percent say they would be willing to pay higher taxes so that school funding could be increased.

School vouchers have been a controversial issue in the national debate on education. Younger adults are considerably more open to the idea of vouchers than older Virginians. Seventy percent of those age 29 and under favored vouchers compared to 39 percent of those 45-64 and 32 percent of those over age 65.

While the public schools face many kinds of problems, lack of parent involvement is perceived to be chief among them. Fifty-six percent of Virginians feel that lack of parent involvement is a major problem for local schools and nearly three in ten (27 percent) feels this is a minor problem. Parents, themselves, are nearly as willing to fault a lack of parent involvement. Nearly half (47 percent) of public school parents say that lack of parent involvement is a major problem for schools in their community. Households with school employees are also concerned about this; 61 percent of this group consider lack of parental involvement to be a major problem for schools.

There is widespread agreement among Virginians that teaching character and values is an important mission for the schools in addition to teaching more academic subjects. More than seven in ten (72 percent) said this was very important and 22 percent thought it somewhat important. While nearly everyone agrees that parents need a primary role in teaching character and values more than four in ten think responsibility for teaching character and values should be shared between parents and schools. Forty-six percent of Virginians feel parents and schools should have an equal responsibility and 53 percent feel only parents should have primary responsibility in this regard.

The Board received the report on the results of the Second Commonwealth Education Poll conducted for the Commonwealth Educational Policy Institute by the VCU Center for Public Policy.

Status Update on Revisions to the Teacher Resource Guide for History and Social Science

The Board should receive a draft copy of the Teacher Resource Guide for History and Social Science by the first or second week of July. It will also be an action item on the Board's July agenda.

PUBLIC COMMENT

The following person spoke during public comment:

Mickey VanDerWerker

DISCUSSION OF CURRENT ISSUES

Dr. DeMary informed the Board that the contract with NCS Pearson, Inc. was renewed for implementation of the Standards of Learning Technology Initiative. The \$114 million initiative, which was approved by the 2000 General Assembly, provides funding and technological assistance for the development of on-line testing and an array of Web-based instructional and remedial programs. The first objective of the initiative is to connect every high school classroom in Virginia to an internet-ready local area network by 2003 and provide computer access at the ratio of one computer for every five students.

Mr. Schroder said that the Board of Education's Student Advisory Committee met on June 16, 2001. The students discussed a variety of issues such as, SOL, substitute teachers, time in the classroom, and special education. Starting with the Board's September agenda, space will be reserved on the agenda for the Student Advisory Committee if they wish to forward documents or statements to the Board. Mrs. Genovese attended the meeting, along with the following staff members from Policy and Public Affairs at the Department of Education: Anne Wescott, Cindy Cave, Margaret Roberts, David Crossley, and Sandra Peterson. Mr. Schroder thanked Dr. Cave for coordinating the meeting.

RECESS

Mr. Schroder recessed the meeting until 1:00 p.m.

RECONVENE: JOINT SESSION WITH THE STATE COUNCIL OF HIGHER EDUCATION FOR VIRGINIA

At 1:10 p.m., Mr. Schroder reconvened the Board of Education with the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV). The joint meeting was held in House Room 4 of the Virginia State Capitol. The chair of SCHEV, Mr. John D. Padgett introduced the members of SCHEV, and Mr. Schroder introduced the members of the Board of Education. Following brief introductory remarks from Mr. Padgett and Mr. Schroder, Dr. Thomas Elliott, assistant superintendent for teacher licensure at the Department of Education, introduced the topic of discussion for the joint session.

Teacher Supply and Demand Projections for the Mid-Atlantic Region

The joint session opened with a presentation by Dr. Simon Condcliffe, a member of the staff at the Center for Applied Demography and Survey Research at the University

of Delaware. Dr. Condliffe reported the results of a research study on teacher supply and demand projections for the mid-Atlantic region. Dr. Condliffe conducted the study under a contract and as a part of the work of the task force.

Dr. Condliffe explained that the economics of the market for teachers includes the following factors:

1. Highly regulated;
2. Pay based on age and education;
3. Limited reward for pay based on performance or productivity;
4. Skills not easily transferable;
5. Productivity gains expected without compensation; and
6. No acknowledgment of supply and demand.

Dr. Condliffe gave extensive data on the demographics of the teaching force and student enrollment in the mid-Atlantic region and in Virginia. He found that for the mid-Atlantic region the average age of a teacher is 40-49 years; 86 percent of the teachers are Caucasian; 75 percent of the teachers are female; 68 percent of the teachers are married; and two-thirds live in a dual income family. The predicted teacher supply for Virginia shows that the teaching force is expected to shrink by 4 percent between the years 2000 and 2015; however, the student enrollment in the public schools is expected to grow by 4 percent during that same time period. Thus, the supply of teachers is going down, while the student population is going up.

Dr. Condliffe's study examined reasons why persons choose not to enter the teaching profession. Some of the possible reasons are as follows: non-portability of skills/certification from state to state; non-portability of pensions; inferior pay relative to alternatives; pay insufficient to support family; negative perception of profession. Also reported were the possible reasons for leaving the teaching profession: inferior pay relative to alternatives; pay insufficient to support family; expected productivity gains without compensation; lack of institutional support; and insufficient teacher training.

In addition, many in the teaching force are at retirement age. Reasons given for retirement include the following: starting a second career; joining a spouse in retirement; expected productivity gains without compensation; and lack of institutional support.

Dr. Condliffe's study identified several strategies to increase teacher supply. These strategies include: deregulate (decrease the red tape teachers must deal with); improve pay; use hiring and retention tools of industry; encourage eligible retirees to continue working; and attract persons to teaching as a second profession.

The study further found that Virginia is a net importer of teachers. Historically, Virginia's school divisions have hired approximately 4,000 new teachers per year. In 1999-00, Virginia's school divisions hired 6,000 new teachers due to earlier retirement options and a statewide reduction in class size requirements. In 2000-01, approximately 7,100 new teachers were hired statewide.

Virginia institutions of higher education graduate approximately 4,000 persons trained to teach. Only 42 percent of these graduates remain in the state and not all that remain choose to teach. In order to fill the teacher vacancies, Virginia hires new teachers from Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Tennessee, Kentucky, and West Virginia.

Virginia has some incentives for teachers. One of these includes provisions to encourage and reward for National Board Certification. Virginia pays half of the application cost, plus \$1,000 towards the certification process. For teachers receiving the National Board Certification, a \$5,000 grant is to be paid to the teacher in the first year, and \$2,500 is to be paid for each of nine additional years. Another incentive offered by a few local divisions (not by the state) is a signing bonus. Virginia also offers a limited number of forgivable loans to full- or part-time college students who train to become teachers in critical shortage areas. Finally, Virginia offers provisional/conditional licenses.

Dr. Condliffe concluded his presentation by stating that research shows that teacher effectiveness is the single biggest factor effecting academic growth in students. Better teachers translate to a better educated work force.

Mr. Schroder thanked Dr. Condliffe for his report.

Report of the Joint Task Force on the K-12 Teaching Profession in Virginia

The meeting was then chaired by Mrs. Susan Genovese and Mrs. Whitney Adams of SCHEV, the co-chairs of the Joint Task Force on the K-12 Teaching Profession in Virginia. The co-chairs explained that the Joint Task Force on the K-12 Teaching Profession in Virginia was established in a resolution that was jointly approved in May 2000 by the members of the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. The purpose of the Joint Task Force was to develop a series of recommendations on issues facing the teaching profession in Virginia and advise the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia of such initiatives for their review and action.

The Joint Task Force on the K-12 Teaching Profession in Virginia was comprised of teachers, administrators, a school board member, a division superintendent, deans, college and university representatives, community college officials, a parent representative and representatives from professional organizations including the Virginia Education Association, Virginia Association of School Superintendents, and Virginia Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. The Department of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia staffed the task force.

The joint task force convened three meetings held in January, March, and May of 2001. The task force began its work focusing on the areas of teacher preparation; teacher recruitment and retention; teacher support, development, and assessment; and the K-16 teaching and learning environment. Organized into four committees in these broad

areas, committee members met and communicated electronically to prepare for full task force meetings.

During the second meeting of the task force, Dr. Penny M. Earley, Vice President of Governmental Relations and Issue Analysis, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and Dr. Terry Dozier, National Teacher in Residence and Associate Professor at Virginia Commonwealth University, made presentations to the task force on “Comprehensive Approaches to Advancing Teacher Quality” and “Eliminating Barriers to Improving the Teacher Profession.” Mr. Wallace Stettinius, Senior Executive Fellow at the School of Business, Virginia Commonwealth University, facilitated a session to discuss the vision for enhancing the teaching profession.

Vision Statement for the Joint Task Force:

The task force developed the following vision statement:

Teaching is a valued profession that attracts, develops, and retains skilled, talented, and diverse individuals who effectively advance learning for all students.

Investigations by the task force focused primarily on the fact that Virginia’s system of public education are possibly facing an unprecedented shortage of teachers at a time of growing student enrollments, increasing retirement rates for teachers currently in service, and a growing trend of teachers choosing to leave the profession. Further, economic and demographic conditions have created an uneven distribution of the teaching force, making teacher shortages most intensely felt in urban and rural areas where quality teachers are most needed.

Mrs. Genovese and Mrs. Adams continued the discussion with the following summary of the task force’s work to date. The task force’s discussion focused around the following three broad areas:

1. Data (Supply and Demand);
2. Recruitment, Preparation, and Retention; and
3. Assessment.

Mrs. Genovese explained that, while the task force has developed a variety of recommendations, it recognized the need to develop a comprehensive long-range plan to deal with effective development and implementation of these and future recommendations. In order to accomplish this goal, the task force recommends the following:

The establishment of a permanent advisory body representing all constituent groups that will make recommendations on the development and implementation of a comprehensive state plan

dedicated to supporting and elevating the teaching profession in Virginia.

Work plans will be developed for recommendations regarded as priority by the Board of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia. Each plan will address at least the following:

- Research;
- Implementation Strategies;
- Timelines; and
- Budget

Research: Database on the Supply and Demand for the Teaching Force:

The SCHEV representatives gave this portion of the report. Meeting the challenges facing the future of the teaching profession in Virginia will require a strong database system that includes information on students enrolled in teacher education programs and graduates employed in school districts across the state. Although helpful, data on national employment trends do not provide the tracking and performance information needed for statewide and local analysis and decision-making related to recruitment, preparation, and retention of K-12 teachers in the Commonwealth.

SCHEV's existing student-specific database provides a rich source of data that can be used to track student progress throughout the college years, but the system lacks an effective mechanism for identifying students who intend to pursue a career in teaching. Under current requirements for licensure, undergraduate students do not major in education. Therefore, the students can only be identified by majors in the arts and sciences. A mechanism will need to be developed to accurately and adequately identify those students who intend to enter the teaching profession. The database system also should maintain information such as the enrollment capacities of teacher preparation programs at Virginia colleges and universities.

The task force report states that SCHEV, in conjunction with the Department of Education, also will need to add information to the database that will permit a more sophisticated analysis necessary to provide meaningful insights into supply and demand issues related to training, recruitment, retention and migration of teachers. Teacher employment data from school divisions statewide must be collected and maintained in a database to permit analysis of potential, current, and future teacher shortage areas—both by subject area and geographical region.

To address issues related to teacher supply, data must be collected from teacher education programs on the number of graduates, student qualifications, and eligibility for licensure and endorsements in various teaching fields. Data must be collected from school divisions on the number of teachers working outside their endorsement areas or working with provisional licensure. Issues related to the demand for teachers will also require data on K-12 enrollment growth and employment needs and opportunities, which

can be used to develop projections for the number of teachers needed in specific teaching areas and geographical regions of the Commonwealth. These data will be useful also in developing effective strategies for the recruitment, preparation, and retention of teachers.

The task force recommendations for developing a central clearinghouse of data are as follows:

- Develop a statewide comprehensive data plan to collect supply and demand information on instructional personnel, including rates of attrition, numbers of teacher and administration vacancies by subject field, grade, and geographic region, etc.
- Develop a statewide system to share information among school divisions, institutions of higher education, the Virginia Department of Education, and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia.
- Establish or revise systems in the Department of Education and the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia that will support the statewide data system.

Teacher Recruitment and Retention:

The Department of Education staff assisted in this section of the report. The Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) established high standards for student achievement. Essential to the achievement of the SOL is the presence of a qualified teacher in every classroom in the Commonwealth.

Expectations for teacher performance have increased at the same time the supply of teachers has significantly decreased. For example, the predicted number of new teachers needed for our public schools for 2000-2001 was 7,604. Virginia colleges and universities graduated fewer than 4,000 teachers from their teacher preparation programs. Some of these graduates return to their home states to teach, and some of these graduates opted not to start a teaching career.

Some action has been taken to enhance the qualified pool of candidates. However, the task force finds that more incentives are needed to recruit, prepare, and retain quality teachers and is recommending the following strategies to revitalize the teaching profession:

The task force recommendation is to design and implement a differentiated staffing model complemented by a multi-tiered licensure system to include at least the following:

- Increase salaries of Virginia teachers at least to the national average.

- Develop a staffing model that includes a variety of teaching levels with corresponding salary scales. The corresponding salary scales would be based on criteria outlining required knowledge and skills to perform levels of responsibility.
- Offer higher salaries to teachers who agree to teach in high need areas by geographic location and discipline.
- Develop a peer review system as a component of the model.
- Require a residence year for all beginning teachers that could be completed through a teacher preparation program or during the first year of employment
- Allow portability of credentials, retirement benefits, and credited years of Experience.

The task force recommendation to encourage the development of a Virginia Public Education Foundation dedicated to supporting public education and the teaching profession includes the following activities:

- Develop a statewide public relations campaign to raise public awareness of the value and importance of teaching as a profession.
- Expand and increase teacher recognition programs so that excellence is rewarded.

The Task force recommendation to develop and implement a comprehensive program to recruit and prepare prospective teachers includes, but should not be limited to, the following:

- Promote rigorous and challenging teacher preparation programs.
- Create closer relationships between K-12 schools and colleges/universities for the preparation and induction of teachers
- Establish targeted recruitment programs such as “Teachers for Tomorrow” programs that encourage middle and high school students to teach.
- Enhance community college partnerships to encourage the use of transfer programs.
- Develop a plan to recruit college students into special needs areas.
- Expand existing scholarship programs to students in career switcher programs and out-of-state students who remain in Virginia to teach.

- Offer student loan forgiveness, signing bonuses, or relocation support.
- Develop career switcher programs for talented mid-career individuals who wish to become teachers.
- Provide a mechanism to communicate opportunities, whether approved program or alternative route, in teaching (e.g., a “TEACHVa” Web site).

The task force recommendation to provide teacher and administrative support and continuous professional development includes the following activities:

- Provide multi-tiered opportunities for administrative and teacher training and development.
- Extend contract/work schedule for teachers to allow time for professional development/continuing educational opportunities.
- Develop teacher academies and exchange programs.
- Increase support of the National Board Certification bonus program and support higher education in developing programs to support teachers in the process of applying for National Board Certification.
- Establish appropriate funding for mentor teacher programs to support first-year teachers making the transition from preparation to their teaching assignments.
- Provide professional development to school administrators (principals and superintendents) by encouraging collaborations between the Schools of Business, Leadership, and Education.

Assessment:

The task force report concludes that, while a number of ongoing national research projects explore the characteristics of effective teaching-and-learning behaviors, Virginia needs more focused research connected to the Commonwealth’s Standards of Learning.

By establishing a fund to support the development of collaborative action-research projects, Virginia could develop a model that brings K-12 and higher education faculty together to more closely link educational practices and research about teacher effectiveness with student learning. The task force report asserts that research on accurate data on teacher qualifications and effectiveness must be tied to student learning to ensure the following:

- That the teacher-education programs are producing the most qualified and effective teachers;
- That licensure requirements are enabling the most talented teachers to enter the classroom; and
- That learning environments are creating the most powerful learning experiences for students, as represented by the Standards of Learning.

To accomplish these goals, SCHEV will work with the following organizations and agencies in order to implement the task force recommendations:

- The Department of Education to develop a fund that would provide support for action-research projects designed to provide insight into the characteristics of effective teacher and powerful learning environments.
- Two- and four-year colleges and universities to develop mechanisms to identify and track students as teacher education candidates;
- Two- and four-year institutions to develop formats for annual reports that track graduation rates and student qualifications (e.g. licensure pass rates, endorsements);
- The Department of Education to review annually results of Praxis examinations/Title II reports to assess the effectiveness of programs in preparing students for licensure;
- The Department of Education to develop a research agenda and budget to examine the relationship between teacher qualifications and student learning;
- The Department of Education to develop data systems and reporting mechanisms for employment data that interface with SCHEV's student-specific database; and
- Facilitate research for program and policy development in education by establishing a Center for Education Excellence at a college or university.

Possible Funding Sources:

The task force reports that in addition to state funding, other funding sources may be sought such as the following:

- U.S. Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education: The U.S. Department of Education will award

approximately 14 grants nationally ranging in size from \$375,000 to \$1,500,000 (average size-\$700,000), over a three-year period.

- The Virginia Department of Education proposes to submit a grant to continue the pilot career switcher programs conducted during the summer of 2000 for military retirees and the summer of 2001 for other professionals. Through funds obtained under the Transition to Teaching Program, the Department will provide scholarships to prospective teachers and issue grants to local school divisions and other “certified program providers,” to recruit, train, place, and provide follow-up support to mid-career professionals from various fields. The grant funding would target individuals who possess strong subject-matter skills and who obtain teaching positions in the critical shortage areas, including special education. Grants must be postmarked by June 15, 2001, with funds available around October 1, 2001.
- The Education Commission of the States (ECS): ECS has funding to offer meetings and follow-up technical assistance to 25 states. States may apply for the technical assistance on a first-come, first-served basis with the request coming from the Governor. These funds could be used to assist the lead agencies in developing a plan outlining the research, best practices, implementation strategies, timelines, and budget.
- The Appalachian Educational Laboratory: AEL is a nonprofit, regionally oriented education research, development, and service institution. Its mission is to link the knowledge from research with the wisdom from practice to improve teaching and learning. AEL works closely with schools, school districts, and states to develop, test, and refine practical products and processes that address needs expressed by local educators. Resources thus developed are then available to others working on similar problems. AEL’s focus for the immediate future is to assist states in designing and implementing data collection system.

At the conclusion of the task force report, the members of the Board of Education and SCHEV discussed actions that should be taken to continue the priorities established by the task force. The Board and SCHEV agreed to take three actions:

1. The task force’s recommendation to form a permanent Task Force on the K-12 Teaching Profession in Virginia was accepted. The current task force members will meet for one more meeting, then a new task force will be named by the Board and SCHEV. The new task force’s

membership will represent the various constituencies involved in the K-12 teaching profession. The new membership will be named at the October or November 2001 meetings of the Board and SCHEV.

2. SCHEV agreed that its staff will begin work on the database. At the October or November meeting, SCHEV will make its recommendations on how the database will be developed and implemented.
3. The current task force will draw up a recommended time line for how the new task force (to be named in October or November 2001) will carry out its duties and make its future proposals to the Board of Education and to SCHEV.

Mr. Schroder thanked Mrs. Genovese and Mrs. Adams for their work on behalf of the joint task force.

ADJOURN FOR THE DAY

The joint session adjourned at 3:00 p.m. Mr. Schroder announced that the Board of Education will convene for the annual planning session at 9:00 a.m. on Thursday, June 21, 2001.

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA
BOARD OF EDUCATION
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA

ANNUAL PLANNING SESSION:
THE VIRGINIA STANDARDS OF QUALITY

June 21, 2001

The Board of Education and the Board of Vocational met for the annual planning session in House Room 4 in the State Capitol Building, Richmond, Virginia, with the following board members present:

Mr. Kirk T. Schroder, President
Ms. Susan T. Noble, Vice President
Mrs. Audrey B. Davidson
Mrs. Susan L. Genovese

Mr. Scott Goodman
Dr. Gary L. Jones
Mrs. Ruby W. Rogers

Dr. Jo Lynne DeMary,
Superintendent of Public Instruction

Mr. Schroder, president, presided and called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m.

OPENING COMMENTS

Mr. Schroder opened the meeting by welcoming the audience members, including a class of graduate students from George Washington University's graduate program in Richmond.

Mr. Schroder stated the purpose of the annual planning session today was to learn about and discuss Virginia's Standards of Quality (SOQ). He noted that funding is a big issue in Virginia and one of the essential elements of funding is the state's SOQ. While much is said about the SOQ, little is understood about these standards—how they operate and how they apply to Virginia's system of funding Virginia's school system. Mr. Schroder noted the Board of education's constitutional role in promulgating the SOQ. While the final authority rests with the General Assembly, the Board has an important role in defining and adopting the standards. Mr. Schroder pointed out that for the past ten years, the Board has strayed from that role. In the past the Board initiated an SOQ bill on a two-year cycle during the 1970s and into the 1980s. In the late 1980s, that cycle was suspended, leaving it to the General Assembly to make adjustments in this important and far-reaching document. Now, the Board has a strong desire to reassert itself into the SOQ revision process.

The Board now needs to explore the feasibility of establishing a more formal protocol with the General Assembly for the revision of the SOQ. Mr.

Schroder said that the meeting discussion today represents the first step in the process of reacquainting the Board with the SOQ process and the Board's role in the revision process.

Mr. Schroder introduced Dan Timberlake, assistant superintendent for finance, for his work to put together the agenda for the day. Mr. Timberlake gave a brief overview of the day's agenda: legislative and legal history and background of the SOQ, overview of the contents of and policy issues related to the SOQ, and an explanation of the funding aspects of the SOQ. The Board will also hear from the localities and some statewide organization relative to their views of the SOQ and funding policy issues.. Mr. Timberlake emphasized that the program for the day is designed to help the Board members understand the policy and funding aspects of SOQ and how these are intertwined.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF THE SOQ

Mr. Timberlake then introduced Ms. Kathleen Harris, an attorney with the Division of Legislative Services, who will give a presentation on the legislative history of the SOQ. Ms. Harris began her presentation by acknowledging the work of Mr. A. E. Dick Howard and his commentaries on the Virginia Constitution. An outline of Ms. Harris' presentation follows:

- Development of Public Schools-- Standards for schooling were nonexistent in colonial Virginia-- System mirrored practice of rural England
 - Private tutorial instruction
 - Apprenticeships and "charity" schools
 - Obligation of church to "examine, catechise and instruct the youth and ignorant persons"
 - "Workhouse" schools
- Gubernatorial certification of schoolmasters
- Old field schools--elementary or ungraded private schools
- First "free" or public school in Virginia in 1643
 - Symms School and Eaton Free School in Elizabeth City County
- 1779: "Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge" (Jefferson)
 - Establish local school districts
 - Three years' free tuition for boys and girls
- 1796: Creation of public schools by local initiative
- Virginia Constitutions of 1776 and 1830

- 1851 Constitution: Capitation tax for education in "primary and free schools"
- 1870: Article VIII, § 1, Virginia Constitution
 - Plan for "uniform system of public schools"
 - Implementation by 1876
 - First "standards:" teacher training, textbooks, and General Assembly authority to prescribe laws
- 1904: Minimum requirements for instruction and teacher qualifications (BOE)
- 1907: Course of study for elementary schools
- 1913: High school accreditation program
- 1922: First compulsory attendance laws
- 1945: Regulations for 12-yr. public school system in all localities
- 1954: Brown v. Board of Education: Massive resistance and School closures
- 1960: Spong Commission
- 1966: Sales tax revenues for public schools
- 1967: Special committees to recommend a plan for enhancing public education and standards for accrediting elementary schools
- 1968: Commission on Constitutional Revision
- 1970: Recommendations approved by voters
- 1971 Virginia Constitution -- Mandate for Standards

"That free government rests, as does all progress, upon the broadest possible diffusion of knowledge, and that the Commonwealth should avail itself of those talents which nature has sown so liberally among its people by assuring the opportunity for their fullest development by an effective system of education throughout the Commonwealth." Bill of Rights, Va. Constitution, Art. I, § 15

"The General Assembly shall provide for a system of free public elementary and secondary schools for all children of school age throughout the Commonwealth and shall seek to ensure that an

educational program of high quality is established and continually maintained.” Va. Constitution, Art. VIII, § 1

“Standards of quality for the several school divisions shall be determined and prescribed from time to time by the Board of Education, subject to revision only by the General Assembly...” Va. Constitution, Art. VIII, § 2

“The General Assembly shall determine the manner in which funds are to be provided for the cost of maintaining an educational program meeting the prescribed standards of quality...”

- August 7, 1971: BOE adopts first SOQ
- 1972: Revised by General Assembly
 - Personnel, program, planning & management
 - Division performance, planning "objectives"
 - Graduation rates, student achievement goals, and classroom management (within Act--c. 732)
- Initially adopted as uncodified Acts of Assembly, called “§ 1 bill”
- Typically revised concurrently with biennial budget; prior versions repealed, replaced
 - Occasionally amended in second year of biennium
- 1974: 8 "simplified" standards (c. 316)
 - Pupil-teacher ratios
 - Special, gifted, and vocational education
 - Kindergarten by 1976
 - Separate performance objectives (HJR 161)
- 1984: First codified ~ Title 22.1
 - 12 standards
 - Amend rather than repeal (exception: 1988)
 - Education committee chairs as bill patrons

- 1988: SOQ in current format
- 1988: Eight Standards defined, as follows:
 1. Basic skills, programs, personnel
 2. Support services
 3. Accreditation, other standards and evaluation
 4. Literacy passports, diplomas and certificates
 5. Training & professional development
 6. Planning & public involvement
 7. Policy manual
 8. Compliance & enforcement

Ms. Harris outlined a chronological history of each standard, as follows:

Standard 1: The Standards of Learning

- “educational objectives”
- 1976: BOE to develop by 197
- 1981: BOE objective
- 1984: “minimum skills objectives”
- 1986: Standard 1: “known as the Standards of Learning”

Standard 2: Support Services

- 1988: To ensure quality education
- 1991: Local divisions to have “efficient” and “cost-effective” administrative, supervisory services-- 1997: Technical assistance for design of summer school, remediation

Standard 3: The Standards of Accreditation

- 1972: “accrediting standards”
- 1984: Standard 10
- 1986: Defined as Board regulation
- 1988: Current Standard 3

Standard 4: Literacy Passports, diplomas and certificates

- 1988: LPT
- 1993: LEP exceptions
- 1997: Pre-test encouraged; analysis of pass/fail
- 1998: LPT phase-out

Standard 5: Training and professional development

- 1976: Personnel development, teacher preparation (Standards 5 & 6)
- 1978-1986: Staff preparation and development (Standards 8, 9)
- 1988: Current Standard 5
- 1990-2000: Gifted students; educational technology; leadership standards; evaluations

Standard 6: Planning and public involvement

- 1972: 5-year plan; annual update
- 1976: 6-year improvement plan; biennial revision
- 1988: Current Standard 6
- 1990-2000: Public hearing; educational technology

Standard 7: Policy manual

- 1972: Developed with school personnel
- 1974: Grievance, evaluation procedures
- 1976-1984: Availability for review; student conduct standards; selection of instructional materials; community involvement
- 1988: Current Standard 7
- 1990-2000: Periodic review

§ 22.1-253.13:8: “Only” standards; compliance

- 1972: “shall alone be the standards of quality”
 - 1978: BOE authority to seek compliance through AG
 - 1980: AG authority to file writ of mandamus; has not been used to date
 - 1988: Current section
 - 1990: SOQ are “minimum” standards
-
- 1984: Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future: equal access to appropriate education
 - 1986: Governor's Commission on Excellence in Education
 - 1990: Educational Opportunity for All Virginians (Exec. Order No. 4)
 - overcoming differences in educational programs
 - widespread practice among school divisions of exceeding Standards
 - 1991 Opinion of the Attorney General: SOQ “define the right to an education guaranteed by the Constitution of Virginia”
 - SOQ “intertwined with, but cannot be overshadowed by, the appropriations process.”
 - 1992: World Class Education/Common Core proposed and withdrawn in 1993
 - 1992: Six-year Plan to Improve Educational Opportunities for All Virginians

- 1992-94: *Scott v. Commonwealth* decision
 - Education as fundamental right
 - “Substantial equality” in spending and programs not required
 - “...While the elimination of substantial disparity between school divisions maybe a worthy goal, it simply is not required by the Constitution.”
- 1994: Goals 2000 program
 - Roles of Board of Education, Superintendent, General Assembly, Governor were examined
- 1995: Revision of Standards of Learning (SOL); Core SOL revised—mathematics, science, English, and history and social science
- 1996: Governor’s Commission on Champion Schools report issued
- 1996: Commission on Accountability for Educational Excellence (HJR 168)
 - “comprehensive plan” for school accreditation
- 1997: Commission on Future of Public Education (HJR 196)
 - Collegiate, workforce preparation
 - Increased capacity
 - Accountability
- 1997: Revised Standards of Accreditation
 - School accreditation based “primarily” on pupil achievement
 - Standards of Learning tests and other assessments
- 1996-8 Biennial Budget: \$12 million for development and administration of new assessment materials and tests
- April 1996: New state testing to address four revised SOL subject areas at grades 3, 5, 8, and after certain courses in high school
- May 1996: RFP for SOL test development
- October 1996: Harcourt Brace Educational Measurement named vendor for the SOL test development, scoring, and reporting
- Spring 1997: Test validity and reliability
 - Content review committees
 - Technical advisory panel
 - Assessment policy advisory committee
 - Standard-setting committees

- Spring 1998: SOL tests operational

In response to a question from Mr. Schroder, Ms. Harris stated that there is nothing in the Code that would prohibit the Board from putting forward an SOQ bill for consideration by the General Assembly at the upcoming session. Mr. Schroder thanked Ms. Harris for her presentation.

LEGAL HISTORY OF THE SOQ

Joan Murphy, Esq., assistant attorney general, presented this topic. Ms. Murphy acknowledged the basic authority for the topic of the SOQ may be found in the Commentaries on the Constitution of Virginia by A. E. Dick Howard and an article by Houllian Moore in 1971 entitled "An Analysis of the Education Article in the Constitution of 1971," (5 University of Richmond Law Review, 263). Ms. Murphy stated that it is impossible to overemphasize the role of a number of important, key leaders in the developing of the Article 8 of the Constitution of 1970: Mr. Justice Lewis Powell, Oliver Hill, Hunter Andrews, Senator Bill Spong, now-Judge James Turk, former senators Bill Lemon and Adelard Brault, and others. Within the context of the time, these persons were determined that schools would never be closed again in the Commonwealth.

Ms. Murphy pointed out several areas of intense discussion with the constitutional development commission and the members of the General Assembly that adopted the language for the constitution in 1971. One topic was the relationship between Article 1 and Article 8 of the constitution. Article 1 is based on Thomas Jefferson's language on the role of free government. It is aspirational in nature. There were members of the commission that wanted to make this language the educational guarantee. The members of the General Assembly strongly wanted a separate educational article in order to emphasize the importance of and the states' commitment to education.

Ms. Murphy discussed the Scott v. Commonwealth case. What the court decided in this case was whether education in Virginia is a fundamental right under the state's constitution. The court decided yes. The court also defined the parameters of that right as being the state's Standards of Quality. The SOQ is the state's minimum educational program. In Virginia, the General Assembly has the ultimate authority to set that minimum program. Local divisions may certainly exceed those standards with local funds. Also, the General Assembly also determines how the costs of the SOQ are going to be met. In the Scott case, the court decided that equal funding from the state was not required. The "seek to ensure" language in the constitution is important in this regard. The Brown case and a Highland County case were important to set the precedence in this matter. The Highland County case decided that equal funding was not required under the federal constitution.

Ms. Murphy pointed out that the Board of education has a key role in the wording of the Standards of Quality. The 1971 constitution specifically states that "Standards of quality for the several school divisions shall be determined and prescribed from time to time by the Board of Education, subject to revision only by the General Assembly." In

prior Assembly sessions, there have been debates as to whether this language means that the General Assembly can only revise (rather than initiate) changes in the SOQ made as prior action by the Board of Education. However, Ms. Murphy pointed out that the court came out so clearly in the Scott case that the General Assembly has ultimate authority. The General Assembly would, no doubt, be informed by any prior action of the Board, but the General Assembly is not limited to prior action by the Board.

In response to a question from Mr. Schroder, Ms. Murphy said that a formal protocol addressing the process of changing the SOQ would be helpful and that there was nothing in law or the constitution that would prohibit any such protocol.

Mr. Schroder thanked Ms. Murphy for the excellent presentation.

SUMMARY OF THE CONTENT OF THE STANDARDS OF QUALITY

Ms. Anne Wescott, assistant superintendent for policy and public affairs at the Department of Education, presented this topic. An overview of Ms. Wescott's presentation follows.

Constitution of Virginia:

Article VIII, § 1: Public Schools of High Quality to be Maintained

- "The General Assembly shall provide for a system of free public elementary and secondary schools for all children of school age throughout the Commonwealth, and shall seek to ensure that an educational program of high quality is established and continually maintained."

Article VIII, § 2: Standards of Quality

- "Standards of quality for the several school divisions shall be determined and prescribed from time to time by the Board of Education, subject to revision only by the General Assembly."

- "The General Assembly shall determine the manner in which funds are to be provided for the cost of maintaining an educational program meeting the prescribed standards of quality, and shall provide for the apportionment of the cost...between the Commonwealth and the local units of government... Each unit of local government shall provide its portion of such cost by local taxes or from other available funds."

Standard 1: Instructional Programs

- Standards of Learning
 - The Board of Education "...shall establish educational objectives to implement the development of the skills that are necessary for success in school and for preparation for life in the years beyond...known as the Standards of Learning..."
 - As required in the Code, the Standards of Learning are subject to regular review and revision.
 - The Board prescribes assessment methods to determine students' levels of achievement.
- Program of Instruction
 - Local school boards develop and implement a program of instruction for grades K-12, emphasizing essential knowledge and skills, concepts and processes, and the ability to apply the skills and knowledge in preparation for eventual employment and lifelong learning.
 - Local school boards must develop and implement programs of prevention, intervention, or remediation for students who are educationally at risk. State funding for remedial programs is provided pursuant to the appropriation act.
 - Local school boards also implement other programs and services, including:
 - Career and technical education programs
 - Special education services
 - Programs for gifted students
- Staffing Ratios
 - Local school boards must employ a minimum number of licensed instructional personnel for each 1,000 students, as set forth in the appropriation act.
 - School divisions may implement lower ratios in grades K through three with concentrations of at-risk students. Funding is provided in the appropriation act to support lowering the K-3 ratio based on the percentage of students class size, using free lunch eligibility as an indicator of at-risk.

Standard 2: Support Services

- Each local school board provides the necessary support services and pupil personnel services, including administration, instructional support, pupil personnel services, student attendance and health, operation and maintenance of the buildings, and management information systems.
- Pursuant to the appropriation act, support services are funded from basic school aid on the basis of prevailing statewide costs.

Standard 3: Accreditation

- Standards of Accreditation:
 - The Board is charged with establishing standards for accreditation and school accountability.
 - The Board establishes course and credit requirements for graduation from high school.
 - Local school boards must maintain schools that meet the Standards of Accreditation.
- Staffing Requirements:
 - The Standards of Accreditation set minimum staffing levels for principals, assistant principals, librarians, guidance counselors, clerical personnel, and reading specialists.
 - The Board establishes requirements for the licensure of teachers, principals, supervisors, and other professional staff.
- Assessments
 - The Board establishes the end-of-course or end-of-grade tests for various grade levels and classes, which include English, mathematics, science, and history and social studies.
 - Local school boards administer appropriate assessments, including the Virginia State Assessment Program, the Standards of Learning assessments, and the National Assessment of Educational Progress state-by-state assessments.
 - Local school boards also provide teachers and principals with periodic in-service training on assessment measures.

Standard 4: Diplomas and Certificates

- The General Assembly and the Board of Education established the Literacy Passport for students who achieved passing scores on literacy tests. (This is being phased out as of July 1, 2003.)
- Local school boards award diplomas to students who meet the graduation requirements prescribed by the Board of Education, pass the prescribed tests, and meet any other requirements prescribed by the local school board and approved by the Board of Education.

Standard 5: Professional Development

- Members of the Board of Education and local school boards participate in in-service programs on education-related issues.
- The Board is expected to sponsor, conduct, or provide advice on training and professional development for teachers, principals, supervisors, superintendents, and school board members.
- School boards are expected to provide a program of professional development for teachers, principals, and other instructional and administrative staff.

Standard 6: Planning and Public Involvement

- The Board of Education must adopt a statewide six-year improvement plan and a six-year plan for educational technology.
- Local school boards must adopt and revise a division-wide six-year improvement plan, which includes a technology plan consistent with the Board of Education's statewide six-year technology plan.

Standard 7: Policy Manual

- The Board of Education must make copies of Virginia school laws, Board regulations, and copies of relevant opinions of the Attorney General available to local school boards .
- Each local school board must maintain and follow an up-to-date policy manual.

Standard 8: These Are the Only Standards of Quality

- Each local school board must provide the programs and services prescribed in the SOQ, with required state and local funds as apportioned in the appropriation act or provided by the General Assembly.
- The Board has the authority to seek school division compliance with the SOQ. The Attorney General would file a writ of mandamus in circuit court, in the name of the Board, directing the appropriate parties to comply.

Mr. Schroder thanked Mrs. Wescott for the informative presentation and for her assistance in preparing the overall program for the day.

FUNDING THE STANDARDS OF QUALITY

Mr. Timberlake was assisted in this presentation by Kent Dickey and Kelly Richards of the Department of Education. The following is an overview of their presentation:

Through the state's direct aid to public education budget, Virginia provides funding for 136 public school divisions that serve approximately 1.1 million students. State support for direct aid to public education totals approximately \$8.0 billion over the 2000-2002 biennium. The general fund supplies most of this funding. The general fund portion of the direct aid budget is approximately 32% of the state's total general fund budget.

Mr. Timberlake explained that there are three basic types of Direct Aid funding for public education programs in Virginia:

- Funding for the Standards of Quality (SOQ);
- Categorical funding for other mandatory education programs; and
- Incentive-based funding.

The Standards of Quality prescribe the minimum foundation program that all public schools in Virginia must meet. The Standards are established in the Constitution of Virginia and defined in the Code of Virginia. Only the Board of Education and the General Assembly can alter the standards.

Funding the Standards of Quality: Historical Perspective:

- In 1971, the Constitution of Virginia was amended to establish the Standards of Quality and to include language relating to the financing of public education.
- In 1972, the General Assembly enacted the Standards of Quality and Objectives for Public Schools in Virginia, effective for the 1972-1974 biennium.
- During the 1974 General Assembly session, a framework for funding the Standards of Quality was developed that contained four key elements:

- 48 instructional positions for every 1,000 students were funded through Basic Aid;
 - the composite index of ability-to-pay was adopted to distribute Basic Aid;
 - an additional 6 positions for every 1,000 students were funded for vocational and special education; and
 - one percent of the state sales tax was appropriated for public education and distributed to school divisions on the basis of school-age population. This framework resulted in a funding methodology that established a single per pupil amount funded for all division.
- The composite index of ability-to-pay was developed to determine state and local shares of the total SOQ cost for a division.
 - This funding framework remained essentially intact into the 1980s.
 - Throughout the 1970s and 1980s there was continued controversy over whether the state was funding its share of the SOQ.
 - In particular, the funding methodology was criticized for not recognizing local circumstances that impacted costs, which raised questions of educational equity.
 - In the mid-1980s the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Commission (JLARC) studied the issue of funding the SOQ.
 - JLARC considered issues related to pupil equity and tax equity.
 - The study resulted in recommendations for significantly changing the way in which costs were calculated.
 - These changes included:
 - Developing a separate per pupil amount for each division to account for differences in staffing levels based on the application of the established staffing standards, salary differences, and pupil transportation costs; and
 - Establishing the prevailing cost methodology to determine “reasonable” funding levels for instructional salaries and support functions.
 - JLARC did not recommend changing the composite index.
 - The JLARC recommendations were first implemented in the 1988-1990 state budget.

- Today, state funding for the SOQ still follows the basic methodology developed by JLARC. Appendix A to this document provides a list of policy changes that have been made since the 1986-1988 biennium that impacted state funding for the SOQ.

Funding the Standards of Quality: Overview:

- As stated previously, the department follows and the General Assembly provides funding based on the methodology that was developed by JLARC in the late 1980s.
- The JLARC methodology and the current standards are programmed into a computer-based funding model.
- The computer model that calculates the costs of most SOQ accounts relies on the following input data:
 - pupil to staff ratios;
 - salary and fringe benefit rates; and,
 - recent expenditure data for support costs.
- The model uses a “prevailing cost” methodology to determine many cost components of the Standards of Quality.
- The Standards of Quality consist of two funding categories:
 - funding for instructional standards
 - funding for support costs.

Instructional Standards:

- Govern pupil to teacher ratios for the following education programs:
 - Basic Aid, which covers the regular K-12 education program; and
 - Four specialized instructional programs:
 - special education;
 - vocational education;
 - remedial education; and
 - gifted education.
- Funding for the instructional standards covers the salary and benefits for teachers, school-level administrators, and instructional support staff.

- Minimum staffing standards for regular education teaching positions included in Basic Aid are set by the Standards of Quality (Standard 1). The appropriation act guarantees funding for a minimum of 51 instructional positions per 1,000 students through Basic Aid.
- Staffing standards for administrative and instructional support staff positions were originally set by the Standards of Accreditation (SOA) but most are now recognized in the SOQ as well (Standard 3).
- The following chart displays the basic education standards that are now in effect.
- Staffing standards for other education programs required by the SOQ are established in the appropriation act or Board of Education regulations:
A minimum of six professional positions funded for every 1,000 students in average daily membership (ADM) for special education and vocational education;
 - One professional position for every 1,000 students in ADM for gifted education;
 - Nine professional positions for every 1,000 students who score in the bottom national quartile of the Virginia State Assessment Program or who fail the state's literacy tests;
 - Board of Education regulations govern minimum staffing requirements for special education and vocational education.
- Minimum staffing standards are applied to actual enrollment (Fall Membership) and other student counts (for example, the special education child count).
- This approach replaced the previous SOQ staffing standard of 57 positions per 1,000 students.
- The appropriation act still retains the previous 57 per 1,000 student staffing standard as a minimum guarantee so that the conversion to the individually applied standards did not cause a loss of funding for any school division.
- For basic instructional positions, applying the standards by school by grade better recognizes local school configurations that affect cost.

Support Costs:

- Standard 2 (support services) of the SOQ states: “each local school board shall provide those support services which are necessary for the efficient and cost-effective operation and maintenance of its public schools.”
- However, unlike the instructional standards, Standard 2 does not quantify support standards. Instead, it requires that support services be funded through Basic Aid based on prevailing statewide costs.
- The SOQ funds functions that support instructional activities including non-instructional support staff and day to day school operations. These support functions include areas such as:
 - Instructional support;
 - Pupil transportation;
 - Attendance and health;
 - Substitute teachers;
 - Professional development; and,
 - Operations and maintenance of school facilities.
- Recognized support costs are funded through Basic Aid.
- In order to calculate support costs, the SOQ funding model uses actual expenditure data from a previous fiscal year to determine a weighted average of what it costs to operate a school division - this is called the “prevailing cost.”

Prevailing Cost Methodology:

- Funded instructional salaries and support costs associated with the Standards of Quality are based on past expenditure data, which is compiled from the Annual School Report (ASR).
- Data from even-numbered fiscal years is used to establish the base funding for a particular biennium. For example, data from the fiscal year 2000 ASR will be used to calculate prevailing instructional salaries and support funding for the 2002-2004 biennium.
- Prevailing costs are based on a linear weighted average calculation that approximates what most school divisions spend to operate their schools.
- The formula incorporates the costs for every school division but is not unduly influenced by divisions with unusually high or low expenditures.
- Specifically, the weighted average cost calculation assigns a weight of “5” to the middle or median division cost and corresponding declining weights

to costs on either side of the median cost until the highest and lowest costs are assigned a weight of “1.”

- This methodology affords the greatest weight to costs clustered around the middle of the distribution of costs.
- Most school divisions’ actual costs are a little under or a little over the calculated prevailing cost.
- The input data for the linear weighted average calculation is typically a division per pupil cost (such as textbooks) or division average cost (such as instructional salaries).

Costs Calculated Outside the SOQ Model:

- In addition to the support costs calculated by the model’s support processes, the following costs are calculated separately before being incorporated into the model:
 - Superintendent cost;
 - School board cost;
 - School nurse cost; and
 - Pupil transportation cost.
- Costs calculated outside the SOQ model are funded in Basic Aid using prevailing cost factors.
- Per the JLARC recommendations, the prevailing costs for pupil transportation recognize factors that affect costs among divisions including:
 - land area;
 - number of students transported; and
 - special needs students.

Prevailing Revenues:

- Projected prevailing revenues are deducted from calculated SOQ Basic Aid costs to account for revenues generated at the local level. These revenues include:

- Rent
- Pupil transportation
- Other funds
- Rebates and refunds
- Sale of equipment
- Special fees
- Bus gas tax refunds
- Textbook sales
- Sale of supplies
- Day school tuition
- Insurance adjustments

SOQ Model Output:

- The SOQ model produces eight per pupil amounts used in calculating each division's SOQ funding.
- Instructional per pupil amounts include:
 - Basic Aid
 - Vocational Education
 - Gifted Education
 - Special Education
 - Remedial Education
- Instructional fringe benefit per pupil amounts include:
 - Retirement
 - Group Life
 - Social Security
- The per pupil amounts represent the total cost that is shared between the state and localities.

Example SOQ Per Pupil Amounts (PPA) for FY 2001: Calculating Final SOQ Costs:

- The per pupil amounts for the eight accounts calculated by the SOQ model are multiplied by the most recent average daily membership (ADM) projections.
- Total costs are adjusted by the composite index of local ability-to-pay to determine state and local shares.

Calculating Final SOQ Costs:

- The per pupil amount for the Textbook account is based on prevailing textbook expenditures inflated to current level. The resulting funded per

pupil amount is multiplied by projected ADM to calculate the total cost for textbooks, which is shared between the state and localities.

- Retiree Healthcare Credit and Remedial Summer School are calculated using formulas that are specific to each account.

Determining State and Local Shares:

- Article VIII, Section 2 of the Constitution of Virginia authorizes the General Assembly to determine the cost of education as prescribed by the Standards of Quality and to apportion those costs between the state and the local governments.

Determining State and Local Shares: Sales Tax:

- By law, one percent of state sales tax revenues is dedicated to public education.
- Projected sales tax revenue (provided by the Department of Taxation) is distributed among localities based on the triennial school-age population census.
- This distribution of sales tax revenue is subtracted from the total cost of Basic Aid for each division before Basic Aid is split into state and local shares based on the composite index.

Determining State and Local Shares: Composite Index:

- The state uses the composite index of local ability-to-pay to apportion the total cost for each division into state and local shares.
- The composite index of local ability-to-pay is authorized and defined in the appropriation act.

The Composite Index of Local Ability-to-Pay:

- Is used to measure each local government's ability to generate revenue, as a measure of local ability to fund public education.

- It is calculated using three measures of the local tax base:
 - true real estate values (50% of measure);
 - adjusted gross income (40% of measure); and
 - local taxable retail sales (10% of measure).
- Each of these measures is combined into two per-capita components
 - average daily membership (weighted two-thirds)
 - population (weighted one-third).
- Each locality's ability-to-pay is evaluated relative to all other localities' ability-to-pay by dividing individual locality values by total statewide values.
- Finally, the calculation is multiplied by 45 percent so that the average local share is 45 percent and the average state share is 55 percent.
- By law, however, no locality is responsible for more than 80 percent of the total required cost of public education.
- Composite indices for the 2000-2002 biennium range from .1886 (least affluent) to .8000 (most affluent).

What the SOQ Is Not:

- It is important to remember that the SOQ establishes the minimum educational program that public school divisions are required to offer.
- School divisions may offer additional programs and employ additional staff beyond what is required by the SOQ using local funds.
- The funding stream provided for the SOQ is not meant to reimburse school divisions for all actual educational expenditures.
- Therefore, not all of the expenditures incurred by school divisions, and reported on the Annual School Report, are included in the SOQ cost calculations.
- In addition, funding provided for the cost areas recognized by the SOQ is provided based on statewide prevailing averages, not based on divisions' actual expenditures.
- For example, the following activities reported on the ASR are not funded through the SOQ:

- Capital additions (most expenditures for capital replacements are included in SOQ cost calculations);
 - Debt service;
 - Tuition payments; and
 - Fund transfers.
- Further, the following educational programs reported on the ASR are not funded through the SOQ:
 - Summer school;
 - Adult education;
 - Non-regular day education (such as Head Start);
 - Non-LEA programs (such as the Hospitals, Clinics, and Detention Homes program); and
 - School food services.
- In addition, only specific combinations of expenditures reported on the ASR are used to calculate SOQ costs.
- For example, expenditures reported for purchased services under the classroom instruction function are included in SOQ cost calculations, however, purchased service expenditures reported under the facilities function are not included.

Programs Funded Outside the SOQ:

- In addition to the programs funded through the Standards of Quality, the state funds a number of programs that address specific needs of students and school divisions.
- These programs are broken into two groups:
 - Categorical programs
 - Incentive-based programs.
- Categorical programs focus on particular needs of special student populations or fulfil particular state obligations.
- These programs are typically required by state or federal law and/or regulation.
- Examples of these programs include:
 - Various special education programs targeted toward children who, for medical or behavioral reasons, cannot enroll in public schools; and
 - Programs that support vocational and adult education.

- Incentive-based programs are not required by law but are intended to target resources for specific student or school needs statewide.
- School divisions participate in these programs at their option but are usually required to agree to certain terms before they receive state funding and are usually required to provide a local match for state funding.
- Examples of incentive-based programs include:
 - Educational technology program
 - created to provide schools with computer hardware, software, and networking capabilities
 - Primary class size program
 - created to lower class sizes in kindergarten through third grade
 - Maintenance supplement program
 - created to help schools pay for facilities maintenance and repairs

Funding Categorical and Incentive-Based Programs:

- Elementary and secondary programs that are not part of the Standards of Quality are typically funded through student-based formulas or through direct grants per division or school.
- Those that are funded through formulas are usually based on:
 - Calculated per pupil amounts; and
 - The number of students eligible to participate in the program or a proxy for estimating this number (for example, the percent of students eligible for the federal free lunch program is often used as a proxy for the number of students at risk of educational failure)Examples of formula driven programs include:
 - Early Reading Intervention (incentive-based program)
 - English as a Second Language (categorical program)
- Other programs provide fixed grant amounts.
- Examples of these programs include:
 - Educational technology program (incentive-based program)
 - Truancy/Safe Schools program (incentive-based program)
 - Project Discovery (categorical program)

State and Local Shares for Categorical and Incentive-based Programs:

- Many programs require local matches based on the composite index:
 - English as a Second Language;
 - Standards of Learning Remediation; and
 - At-risk Four-Year-Olds.
- A few require the same match for all divisions:
 - Dropout Prevention requires divisions to provide 40 percent of total program funding;
 - Educational Technology requires divisions to provide a match equal to 20 percent of the total grant amount.
- Some are paid entirely by the state:
 - Hospitals, Clinics, and Detention Homes;
 - Foster Care; and
 - Standards of Learning Teacher Training.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Mr. Schroder thanked Mr. Timberlake, Mr. Dickey, and Ms. Richards for their excellent presentation and the hard work it took to put the presentation together.

PRESENTATION BY THE VIRGINIA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION

This presentation was made by Ms. Elizabeth “Beth” Davis, president of VSBA. Ms. Davis noted that VSBA’s position is that the organization will take no position of the Virginia Consortium for Adequate Resources for Education (VCARE--details on this program are listed below) because VSBA represents all school boards and would, therefore, wait for the specifics of VCARE proposals to be developed and released.

Ms. Davis states that the VCARE recommendations have been released and the VCARE-member school boards and their staffs are to be commended for a job well done. Ms. Davis explained that the VSBA staff has compared the VCARE recommendations to existing VSBA policies and recommended to the VSBA Board of directors that:

- It notify all school boards of the congruence between existing VSBA policies and resolutions and the VCARE recommendations;
- Each local school board be notified of VCARE specifics for which VSBA has no existing policy or resolution as a basis to support or oppose;
- Where there is no existing authority for VSBA support or opposition to a specific VCARE recommendation, that each local school board and staff be encouraged to conduct its own analysis and make its own determination as to the position it wishes to convey to its state legislators.

The VSBA Board of Directors, by unanimous vote, approved the recommendations of its staff, and the above recommendations are now the official position of VSBA on the VCARES recommendations. Ms. Davis distributed additional information on the specific policies and resolutions of VSBA as they relate to the recommendations of VCARES.

PRESENTATION BY THE VIRGINIA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS

Dr. Ed Kelly, superintendent of Prince William County Public Schools, and Dr. Ed Hatrick, Superintendent of Loudoun County Public Schools, made this presentation on behalf of VASS.

Dr. Kelly began by stating that, as school superintendents, they are faced every day with the realities of providing the quality of education, which is necessary for our students to meet Virginia's academic standards. He stated that this task is difficult, primarily because of the fact that the state does not provide local divisions with the financial resources needed to insure the quality of education that is expected. The reason for this inadequacy, according to Dr. Kelly's statement, is that the Standards of quality, which are used to determine state funding, do not reflect today's realities of what it takes to meet these expectations. The result is that localities have increased what they spend on education in order to make up for the state's deficiency. Dr. Kelly pointed out that local governments spend approximately \$1.6 billion for education operations beyond the local match required by the SOQ. Most of this funding pays for additional teachers and does not include the additional money needed to pay for capital service and debt service expenses, which were estimated at \$1.6 billion in 1997-98.

Dr. Kelly noted that school divisions, in order to meet the requirements of the Standards of Accreditation, have incurred additional expenses that are not reflected in the SOQ. Thus, the SOQ must be updated in order for localities to receive the funds they need to meet the new state standards. Dr. Kelly also outlined several other issues that necessitate updating the SOQ:

- Staffing ratios on which SOQ funding is based are inadequate. Current SOQ funding does not take into consideration the use of resource teachers and specialists such as guidance counselors and does not address the need for new course offerings.
- The state's use of the "linear estimator" for determining current salaries assumes all school divisions have equal weight regardless of enrollment size. Use of this statistic results in under-funding of salaries.
- State support for capital costs is low. In 1997-98, state support for capital expenditures was only 11.2 percent of all costs for capital outlay and debt service.

- Local governments carry a major portion of the costs to educate children with special needs. A report issued by the Virginia Department of Education in April 2000 showed that the state paid 26 percent of the costs of special education, the federal government paid 9 percent, and the local divisions paid 65 percent.

Dr. Ed Hatrick presented recommendations for changes to Virginia's basic aid formulas. These are the recommendations of VCARES. Dr. Hatrick explained that these recommendations were developed to more accurately reflect the true costs being incurred by school divisions across Virginia. VCARES is recommending funding formula adjustments reflecting the major SOQ changes that have resulted in increased costs for local school divisions. The goal of VCARES is not to recommend a completely new funding formula, but rather to secure funding for the SOQ costs not covered by the current formula. Dr. Hatrick presented the major concerns of VCARES, which are summarized as follows:

- Salaries and benefits: VCARES supports using actual average teacher salaries versus the current use of the linear estimator:

VCARE's analysis based on 1997 data indicated that such an approach would yield a figure 9.7 percent higher for teacher pay.

- State programmatic mandates: VCARES supports having the funding formula reflect current costs to meet state requirements that have been added since the formula was last revised. VCARES supports the following:

A general benchmark of 2 percent of the state appropriation for operation of the schools as a reasonable guideline for funding staff development efforts;

An additional .5 assistant principal position per school;

Remediation should be funded to provide 90 hours of instruction from a certified teacher in a class of 10;

There should be no requirement to lower class size ceilings in general and special education programs;

Incentive funding would be desirable to assist divisions seeking to lower class sizes for at-risk children; and

Increased state funding should be provided to accommodate small class sizes in alternative education programs.

- Costs of funding prevailing practices: VCARES supports ensuring needed best practices that benefit all children beyond the requirements of the SOQ:

The formula should be updated to reflect that nearly every high school in Virginia is now on a 7-period day, requiring 16 percent more teachers than a traditional six-period format;

An additional teacher should be awarded per school to accommodate AP courses;

The state formula should reflect 3 specialists (1 each for art, music, and PE) for every 700 elementary students;

Each school should receive an allotment of \$26,000 for school resource officers and other safety-related personnel; and

The needs of ESL/LEP students should addressed in a manner similar to special education students.

- Technology costs: VCARES supports funding for technology becoming a part of the basic aid commitment to students:

The staffing model used for school librarians would be suitable for technology specialists as well.

- School construction: VCARES supports providing an on-going funding mechanism to assist school divisions in meeting the cost to build new schools and to refurbish existing schools, especially noting that 53 percent of all school buildings in Virginia are more than 30 years old:

The state should provide general capital program support by calculating the square feet of permanent instructional space, dividing by 25 to provide 25 years of useful life, then multiply by the current average cost per square foot for new construction and apply the composite index.

Following the presentations on VCARES, Mr. Schroder invited the presenters to be present at the Board of Education's next meeting on July 26, 2001, in order to continue the discussion on this important topic. Mr. Schroder closed this portion of the agenda by thanking all that participated.

DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY TO PRESIDENT TO DEVELOP FORMAL PROTOCOL

At the conclusion of the presentations, Mr. Schroder opened the floor for discussion by asking the Board if it wished to delegate to the president the task of

developing a formal protocol that would set forth the process and time line for carrying out the Board's duty in regard to prescribing the SOQ. Mr. Schroder stated that, given this authority by the Board, he would move quickly to meet with key legislators to develop and coordinate the contents of a protocol that would reassert the Board of Education into the SOQ revision process, a role that has had a 10-year lapse. Without objection, the Board delegated this authority to Mr. Schroder. Mr. Schroder thanked the Board members for their confidence, and he assured the Board that he will act quickly on this matter.

Dr. Jones pointed out that time is of the essence regarding any modification of the SOQ because of the necessary time lines associated with the upcoming 2002 General Assembly session. Dr. Jones emphasized that the Board needs to begin an analysis of what changes in the SOQ that it may wish to propose.

Dr. Jones pointed out that the process of policy analysis related to the SOQ could begin and run concurrent with the work in which Mr. Schroder will be engaged relative to developing the formal protocol. The Board agreed and decided that the two activities are closely related and should move concurrently. Mr. Schroder asked Dr. Jones and Mrs. Genovese to serve on a subcommittee, with Mr. Schroder serving ex-officio, to conduct the policy analysis of the SOQ and to come up with possible changes to the current document. This concluded the business of the day, and Mr. Schroder recognized Dr. DeMary, who had two announcements related to instruction:

Dr. DeMary announced that an excellent videotape is now available for use for teacher recruitment efforts. The videotape, produced by the Department of Education staff, features five new teachers talking about their role as teachers. This videotape is receiving excellent reviews and will be very useful in recruitment efforts.

Dr. DeMary also announced that an additional resource to help school divisions develop curricula aligned to the 1995 Standards of Learning is now available to teachers and schools. The Department of Education developed sample scope and sequence documents for English, mathematics, and science in kindergarten through grade eight and in core high school courses. Sample scope and sequence guides for the revised History and Social Science Standards of Learning will be released later this summer. Dr. DeMary noted that these sample documents provide guidance on how the essential knowledge, skills, and processes that are identified in the Standards of Learning and the Standards of Learning Teacher Resource Guides may be introduced to students in a logical, sequential, and meaningful manner.

Dr. DeMary added that these sample scope and sequence documents are intended to serve as general guides to help teachers and curriculum developers align their curricula and instruction to support the Standards of Learning. Each sample document is organized around specific topics to help teachers present information in an organized, articulated manner. Also included are correlations to the Standards of Learning for that curricular area for a particular grade level or course, as well as ideas for classroom assessments and teaching resources.

Dr. DeMary emphasized that the sample scope and sequence documents are not intended to prescribe how curriculum should be developed or how instruction should be delivered. Instead, they provide examples showing how teachers and school divisions might present to students in a logical and effective manner information that has been aligned with the Standards of Learning.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business of the Board of Education and Board of Vocational Education, Mr. Schroder adjourned the meeting at 4:14 p.m.

President

Secretary